

III. REMARKS

In the Non-Final Office Action mailed on June 05, 2007, the Examiner: (A) objected to paragraph [0074] of the specification as failing to meet the written description requirement; (B) objected to claim 39 for lack of antecedent basis for the claim term “a core end of the insertion bush”; (C) rejected claims 27, 31, 33-34, and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention; (D) rejected claims 1, 5, 22, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 3,441,659 to Laudig et al. (hereinafter “Laudig”); (E) rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,766,037 to Nelson (hereinafter “Nelson”); (F) rejected claims 2-4, 6-12, 13-15, 17-21, 23-26, 28, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Laudig in view of U.S. Patent 6,281,442 to Guzowski (hereinafter “Guzowski”); and (G) indicated that claim 16 was allowable. Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter. Without conceding the merits of the aforementioned objections and rejections, Applicant has amended the claims and respectfully requests reconsideration of the amended claims in light of the remarks, *infra*. Applicant’s responses to the objections and rejections are set forth as follows.

A. Response to the Objection to Paragraph [0074]

The Examiner objected to the specification for failure to comply with the written description requirement. (Office Action, page 2) Applicant has amended Paragraph [0074] as set forth in Section I, *supra* and submits that amended Paragraph [0074] complies with the written description requirement.

B. Response to the Objection to Claim 39

The Examiner objected to claim 39 for lack of antecedent basis. (Office Action, page 2) Applicant has cancelled claim 39, thereby rendering the objection moot.

C. Response to the Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 27, 31, 33-34, and 37-39 as indefinite. (Office Action, pages 2-4) Applicant has amended claims 27, 33-34, and 37-38 as set forth in Section II, *supra* and submits that amended claims 27, 33-34, and 37-38 particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has cancelled claims 31 and 39, thereby rendering the rejection as to these claims moot.

D. Response to the Examiner's Suggestion to Restructure the Claims

The Examiner stated that “the overall claim structure...is erratic and unnecessarily ambiguous” and “strongly encouraged [the Applicant] to readdress all claims with the objective of restructuring them in a well-ordered, cohesive manner.” (Office Action pages 2-3) In response, Applicant has restructured the claims as follows.

Remaining amended claims 1-28 are all drawn to **“a connecting device for connecting two or more cables.”** Claims 5-8 have been cancelled.

Remaining amended claims 29-40 are all drawn to **“a method for mutually connecting two cable ends.”** Claims 30-31 have been cancelled.

Newly presented claims 41-64 are all drawn to **“a connecting device for connecting a stripped cable end to an end element.”** Although these claims appear as newly presented, claims 41-44 are amended versions of original claims 5-8 and claims 45-64 are amended versions of original claims 9-28.

Newly presented claims 65-72 are all drawn to **“a method for connecting to an end element, a cable end.”** Although these claims appear as newly presented, claim 65 is an

amended version of original claim 31 and claims 66-72 are amended versions of original claims 32-38.

Applicant submits that the restructuring described above puts the currently pending claims in a well-ordered cohesive format that is much easier to read.

Additionally, Applicant has added newly presented claims 73-75 which are drawn to the same concepts described in claims 1-72.

E. Response to the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103

The examiner rejected independent claims 1, 5, and 29 under § 102(b) as anticipated by Laudig and rejected independent claim 31 under § 102(b) as anticipated by Nelson. (Office Action, pages 5-6) As a result of the above described claim restructuring, original independent claims 1, 5, 29, and 31 correspond to amended independent claims 1, 41, 29, and 65, respectively.

Each of these independent claims include the concept of a connecting device that secures the cable to the connecting device as a result of inserting the stripped cable into the connecting device without additional assembly steps such as crimping, screwing, etc. This concept is expressed in claims 1, 29, 41, and 65 as “whereupon insertion of the core(s) into the insertion bush causes the insertion bush to secure the core(s) therein.”

None of the cited references show or suggest a connecting device that secures a cable to the connecting device as a result of inserting the stripped cable into the connecting device without additional assembly steps such as crimping, screwing, etc. Instead, each of the cited references discloses an apparatus or an approach that requires more than merely inserting the stripped cable end into the connecting device to secure the cable to the connecting device.

First, Laudig describes a shielded cable connection where a ferrule is crimped to the conductor and a ceramic shell surrounds the crimped portion. In particular, Laudig states that “the clamping ferrules 82 and 84 are then slid into their final position...in surrounding relationship to the braid 18 and 26...[and] are then crimped into their final operative position” and that “a conventional crimping tool is employed for crimping the various members in operative relationship.” (Laudig, col. 4, lines 30-40) Thus, Laudig’s manually crimped connector fails to show or suggest a connecting device where “insertion of the core(s) into the insertion bush causes the insertion bush to secure the core(s) therein.”

Second, Nelson shows a coaxial cable with a helically corrugated outer conductor being screwed into a connector device having a threaded back nut 30, a clamping collet 40, and a connector body 50. (Nelson, Fig. 1) In particular, Nelson states that, “the back nut 30 is typically threaded onto the [helically corrugated] outer conductor 14 [of the coaxial cable]” and that the collet 40 fits over the back nut 30 “when the [threads of the back nut 30] are engaged with the outer conductor 14 of the cable.” (Nelson, col. 2, lines 32-67) The body 50 is then coupled “with the threaded portion 36 of the clamping back nut 30.” Thus, Nelson’s screw-on connector device fails to show or suggest a connecting device where “insertion of the core(s) into the insertion bush causes the insertion bush to secure the core(s) therein.”

Finally, the Examiner cites Guzowski for “a spring means SS arranged around the conductive layer LS which compresses that layer in a radial fashion.” (Office Action, page 7) This is not related to an insertion bush, and thus Guzowski does not overcome the deficiencies of Laudig or Nelson because Guzowski does not show or suggest a connecting device where “insertion of the core(s) into the insertion bush causes the insertion bush to secure the core(s) therein.”

Therefore, Applicant submits claims 1, 29, 41, and 65 are patentable over Laudig, Nelson, and Guzowski for at least the reason that the references do not show or suggest, individually or in combination, each and every element recited in the claims. Claims 2-28 depend from claim 1, claims 32-39 depend from claim 29, claims 42-64 depend from claim 41, and claims 66-72 depend from claim 65. Accordingly, Applicant further submits that these claims are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable independent claims. Additionally, Applicant submits that newly presented claims 73-75 are also patentable over Laudig, Nelson, and Guzowski for the same reasons applicable to claims 1-72.

III. CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the currently pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 913-2104.

Respectfully submitted,
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: October 5, 2007

By: /Jeffrey P. Armstrong/
Jeffrey P. Armstrong
Registration No. 54,967